

Christian Education

Vol. XVIII

APRIL, 1935

No. 4

GOULD WICKEY, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

ALFRED WMS. ANTHONY

GARDINER M. DAY

HARRY T. STOCK

*Published in February, April, June, October and December
Lime and Green Sts., Lancaster, Pa.*

*By The Council of Church Boards of Education in the
United States of America
744 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D. C.*

October, 1934 to June, 1935

Entered as second-class matter March 29, 1926, at the Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 18, 1918. The subscription price is \$1.50 per annum. Single copies, regular issues, 30 cents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Teacher, <i>B. M. Christensen</i>	211
The Church-Related College and Public Service, <i>William Gear Spencer</i>	212
The Church-Related Liberal College, <i>W. F. Cunningham</i>	218
Calvin H. French—The Christian College Personified, <i>James E. Clarke</i>	227
The Church's Real Problem in Christian Education, <i>F. L. Pickett</i>	234
Methods of Counseling Used By the University Pastor, <i>Roy A. Burkhardt</i>	243
To Those Ministering to Students, <i>Theodore O. Wedel</i>	246
The Student Workers' Round Table, <i>Harry T. Stock</i>	253
What Is New in the Religious Problem of the Twentieth Century? <i>Edwin E. Aubrey</i>	257
The Failures of Secularism, <i>Wm. Lindsay Young</i>	261
Is the Sabbatical Year Worth While? <i>By One Who Has Tried It</i>	268
If I Were a College President Again, <i>H. O. Pritchard</i>	270
A Cause—Not an Institution, <i>An Editorial</i>	271

SPECIAL NOTICE!

Is your file of **CHRISTIAN EDUCATION** complete? Individual numbers of the various volumes as far back as 1922 are available at greatly reduced prices. Cloth bound copies of volumes 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 are for sale. Paper and cloth bound copies of the Handbook for the year 1928, 1931, 1934 can be furnished. Send inquiries to

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION
744 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Christian Education

Vol. XVIII

APRIL, 1935

No. 4

THE TEACHER

B. M. CHRISTENSEN

Augsburg Seminary

The teacher is a lighter of torches amid the darkness of earth, that his fellow-men may follow and find the way.

The teacher enkindles the candles in the souls of men, that they may learn to know the hidden places of their own spirit.

The teacher is a learner who has sat at the feet of the aged, and garnered from their golden treasures in silence.

The teacher is the friend of little children, moulding their gentle spirits after the heavenly pattern of the angels.

The teacher is a cup-bearer, not only to earth's kings, but to earth's slaves, that all may drink of the wine of wisdom and be glad.

The teacher is he whose eyes have been opened to see the stars, and whose ears have been touched that he may hear the weeping of the willows.

The teacher is he for whom a book is a jewelled casket and a printed page is a mystic messenger of the soul.

The teacher's heart has been quickened from the death of self-interest, and made aware of the anguish of his fellow-men.

The teacher walks with God and with man in reverent wonder that so great a privilege should be his portion.

The teacher feels with joy the touch of Time's fleeting hours upon his cheeks, but his spirit lives and breathes in the quiet heights of Eternity.

THE CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGE AND PUBLIC SERVICE*

WILLIAM GEAR SPENCER
President, Franklin College

It is possible to consider this subject either from the narrow point of view of those church colleges subject to the complete domination of church boards or to consider it from the point of view of the far wider field of those institutions whose roots are embedded within denominational areas. It would seem to me that for our purposes the latter would be far preferable, and that will be understood in connection with the discussion that follows. To get a proper perspective of this, it is necessary that we begin with

AN HISTORICAL APPROACH

In the first place, the earliest public servants in our country's history, far more often thought of in connection with their relationship in the fields of administration and in their church relationships, were in the main highly educated men. We think of Elder Brewster as the leader of that early settling expedition to this country, and we think of him as a preacher with his flock. How rarely do we remember that he was a graduate of Cambridge in England, that he taught English at Leyden University in Holland, that he wrote an English grammar, that he was emphatically a scholar, and that he had for the time in which he lived a remarkable library. We think of Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts in his field as an administrator, and his name is familiar to us in that connection; but it is helpful to remember that Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts was a student at Trinity in Cambridge University, England, and that the Cambridge which we have in Massachusetts is the lineal descendant of that institution with its educational centers. We think of Thomas Hooker and of Thomas Shepard; one the great preacher at Cambridge whose inspired preaching was effective in the promulgation of the constitutional idea in this country, and the other the founder of Harvard, both of them graduates of Cam-

* A paper read at the annual meeting of the Council of Church Boards of Education, Atlanta, Ga., Jan. 16, 1935.

bridge in England; John Harvard himself, whose name the institution carries, bringing to this country a master of arts degree from Cambridge in England. Henry Dunster was a graduate of Magdalen College. Abraham Pierson, the first rector of Yale University, was a graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge, and James Blair, who solicited funds and a charter for William and Mary and who was the first president of the same, was an M.A. from Edinburgh University of the class of 1673. And last, but by no means least, William Penn, whom we think of as agreeing to an unwritten and unsigned treaty, never broken, under the tree with the Indian chief, and whose name we associate with the great state of Pennsylvania, was a student at Oxford College in England, and while not finishing his course, undoubtedly brought a good deal of his capacity from the training in that institution.

It is perfectly evident, then, that public service was from the beginning of the settlement of this country a natural concomitant of church relations and that education was the largest factor in its leadership.

OUR COUNTRY'S CRISES

It is rather fascinating to observe that the first crisis in our country's history came on account of the death of this educated leadership. Citizens having made the sacrifice to come over and recognizing that that leadership was necessary for the perpetuity of the value of that sacrifice, began to found colleges to turn out that kind of leadership,—Harvard with its motto, Christo et Ecclesiae; Yale with its motto, Lux ac Veritas; William and Mary, the cornerstone of which reads, "Whereas the want of able and faithful ministers in the country deprives us of those great blessings and mercies that always attend the service of God," William and Mary the training ground of democracy and the inspiration of the Declaration of Independence. In the decade before the revolutionary war, Harvard turned out approximately 29% of her alumni into the Christian pulpits; Yale, 32%, and Princeton, 45%, it being understood that the Christian pulpits in those days practically included the mayorship in the communities, frequently the position of chief teacher, and even consulting attorney, and that they were supported by taxation. How great a rush to the ministry there might be today if taxation were its support instead of voluntary contributions!

Colgate University, which up to 1910 had graduated approximately 1700 men, had sent nearly a thousand of them into fields of Christian leadership. One out of six of the men who have graduated from Franklin College with its hundred years of history has gone into public service in the church-related fields. We shall never be able to know how much it has meant for the first fifty years of habit-forming thinking in this country that the leadership came from those campuses on which altruism and not selfishness was stressed. Today the religious, ecclesiastical and church programs of our country are largely interpreted by graduates of the church-related college, with an extraordinary area of public service in that field.

The second crisis in the history of the country was caused by the events leading up to the revolution. While we are still discussing the historical approach, carry in mind Samuel Adams, alumnus of Harvard University, whose whole life was given to public service. He was a man for whom neither pleasure, nor success, nor money, nor catering to private tastes, nor society found prime place; whose sole aim was public service and who gave to this country public service to such an extent that when he signed the Declaration of Independence, he signed it with a price already set on his head. Of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, nine were from Cambridge, Glasgow, Edinburgh and with special education in France and England; eight were from Harvard, four were from William and Mary, four were from Yale, two from New Jersey College, two from Philadelphia, and two with special privileges in education; so that out of the fifty-six signers of the Declaration of Independence, twenty-five were college graduates and thirty-one were men with unusual privilege in education. Quite remarkable, when you come to think of it, the price these men were willing to pay, coming from these campuses to leadership. Alexander Hamilton, a graduate of Kings College, now Columbia, and Aaron Burr, a graduate of Princeton, each up to the point in history at which they divided bringing a remarkable contribution to the development of the youthful country. This contribution has not ceased in the realm of political science and government. Brooks, Dwight and Beecher in the field of religion and constructive politics through our period of slavery; Moley and Ickes today; Hull and Perkins, Fosdick and Hughes; names that might be added

to, not by the dozen or by the score, but by the hundreds, continue to make history in public service.

The third crisis in our country's history might refer to immigration as its cause, and fascinatingly enough, the by-product of immigration, namely the development of compulsory education.

COMPULSORY EDUCATION

has been of tremendous significance to us. Starting with 8,300 immigrants in 1820, the first year of which we have figures, coming up to 1860 with 33,000 and up to 1910 (the day before yesterday) we find that 1,041,570 aliens came into this country to possess the land. What to do? Under the leadership of Horace Mann, a graduate of Brown University of the class of 1819, thoughtful public servant, men became convinced that if the youngsters representing the first generation in this country could be compelled to receive instruction in the ideals which dictated its early settlement and in one language, we might hope to have a homogeneous, united nation. There ought to be a statue of Horace Mann in every high school in the United States, so firmly did he believe in this. He gave up the hope of political preferment to go to Antioch in Ohio to found an educational institution there.

Now the fascinating thing is that education is likewise still today interpreted in this leadership from many of these campuses. So powerful has been the stamp of these church-related colleges that gave to education its first motive power that graduates of non-church-related colleges going into the field of education none the less have to meet *standards of character* that were set for them when the educational trends were first established, and those standards of character are a part of the public service contribution of the church-related colleges. We might speak of the contribution to the crisis caused by

THE REVOLUTION IN INDUSTRY

Everybody knows that Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin, but few people know that he graduated from Yale University in the class of 1792. Everybody knows that Samuel B. Morse invented the electric telegraph, but few people know that he graduated from Yale in 1819. Everybody knows that the telephone was invented by Alexander Graham Bell, but not many people know that he was a college professor at the time. Edu-

cated men today are working in the same fields with the same degree of public service to industry. When we think of Knute Rockne and Notre Dame, we think first of all of athletics. We do not stop to think that the University of Notre Dame is responsible for the development of one of the most important contributions to industry, synthetic rubber, a contribution which came from the Notre Dame department of Chemistry, and that Knute Rockne himself was by way of being an authority in the field of chemistry.

The League of Decency, supported by Catholics and Protestants alike, has been perhaps the most efficient piece of work in recent years in cleaning up the motion-picture industry and making them recognize that there are some standards in society as well as in other fields.

There are two new crises that are modern and immediately upon us. One is

THE WAR AGAINST THE STANDARD OF VALUES THAT IS FINANCIAL

Poteat says that intelligence offers no guarantee against unregenerate impulses, and we have in mind that Loeb and Leopold might represent university education but without final standards of values. It is worth considering that this nation has "passed judgment that a revenue of billions of dollars from liquor is worth more to us than souls and the lives of those who may be harmed by it." We get to be thoughtful when we remember that the "Supreme Court has said that in a nation that has agreed to outlaw war, one must swear to bear arms in a war in order to become a citizen." The profit in munitions must be guaranteed!

Outstanding citizens have emphasized the *material* and the *sensual*. Mencken no longer looks for a meaning in life; Darrow says, "If I were a college graduate today, I would end my life. It has so little purpose." Restraints in sex are the vestiges of an irrational taboo, according to the Russells, and Hollywood presents a working laboratory in that field. The church-related college must make an outstanding contribution to our modern thinking by speaking out in answer to such low standards.

There is still a second crisis in which the church-related colleges need to function in the field of public service. This is the one of which

LEISURE IS THE CAUSE

Unemployment, the invention of machinery, the premium on youth, the closing of frontier territory, and shorter working hours have brought us to a rapid crisis in that field, although Professor Bigge of Brown University is authority for the statement that the pool of unemployment was rapidly being created long before the crisis caused by the depression. The answer to this crisis is not to be found in the usual search for thrills nor in lawlessness. But in a day when, in order to earn a living and to sleep, the mine-run of men still have on their hands as much time for leisure as is needed after both of these have been cared for, the church-related colleges must step forward in the field of adult education, must emphasize the creation and selection of hobbies out of which the personality of the individual will be extended and strengthened, must emphasize a renewed interest in public affairs, and must treat for the first time *leisure* and *work* as *companions*. These become necessary concomitants of our thinking in the present. We may have been raised on the theory that "Satan finds some labor still for idle hands to do," but Satan must no longer be the master in this field, and the church-related college must find public service here.

The new emergence of social engineers for a day of social reconstruction calls particularly for men and women with right attitudes. Unless intellect and science guided by high devotion to Christian ideals lead the way, destruction will possess the land. We might emphasize with Coolidge of Amherst, "It is not what we know, but what we are disposed to do with what we know, that will determine the rise and fall of civilization."

University and state-supported schools are hindered by their very make-up from putting emphasis on religious value. Therefore, the church-related colleges have a peculiar mission today. With half of our students in our undergraduate colleges in church-related colleges and in church-related schools, we owe it to them, as in the days of yore, to send them forth men and women of high integrity and broad culture, who are sensitive to the spirit of Jesus Christ and who in his spirit will contribute to and continue the high-minded leadership of our national and international thinking.

THE CHURCH-RELATED LIBERAL COLLEGE

W. F. CUNNINGHAM

University of Notre Dame

The American Liberal College, as indicated by its name, undertakes to impart to its students a liberal education. What is meant by this phase, "liberal education"? This question is not so easy to answer as at first might be supposed. There has been a great deal of muddled thinking and writing on the subject of Liberal Education in this country during the past two decades. There is one answer to this question, however, which stands out as the supreme example of clear thinking and vigorous writing on this subject. John Henry Newman is recognized by all as a master of English prose. His book, *The Idea of a University*, is held up to students of English composition as a model of the exposition of a theory. But more than that, many are agreed that this great work will endure not only as a literary classic, but also as an educational classic. It is the one book in the English language that deserves a place along side of Plato's *Republic* as one of the great educational classics of the world; the one book in the English language treating of Education that is to endure, and its theme is Liberal Education.

Nevertheless, from one point of view, this book is unfortunate (at least to the American readers), namely, in its title. The American university, from its origin, has been under the influence of the German University ideal. And the German University in history has had a dominating twofold purpose, namely, research, that is, pushing back the boundaries of knowledge and professional training. In contrast with these purposes, English Universities, particularly the two great Universities, Oxford and Cambridge, have always accepted liberal training, not professional training and research, as their primary purpose. The very make-up of these institutions makes this clear. Each of these two Universities is made up of a group of small colleges, each college having its own student body and teaching staff, with facilities for leading the students' lives together. From the very nature of the situation, therefore, we understand why in an

English University liberal education, and not professional training or research, is accepted as its primary purpose. Now, we have no wish to enter into this controversy whether liberal education, in contrast with professional training or research, is the primary purpose of a University. We are concerned with the American Liberal College. As its name indicates, here there is no controversy. Professional training is simply out of place in a liberal college, and research, though it will not be lacking in the activities of a live faculty, must never be primary in the purpose of the college, if the college is to give any promise of achieving its purpose, which is to impart to its students a liberal education.

I. WHAT IS LIBERAL EDUCATION?

What is meant by this phase, "liberal education"? Literally, this word comes from the Latin, "liber" meaning "free." So a liberal education aims at freedom. But freedom from what? First of all, freedom from ignorance as the student grows in knowledge of the social inheritance, that is, the cultural acquisitions of mankind. In the second place, it means freedom from undeveloped capacities, as a student through a process of growth and development converts his innate capacities into actual abilities. The outcomes, when this process of liberation is realized, are knowledge and intellectual power. Here is one of the beautiful passages from Newman, in which he describes the aim and end result of liberal training. In Discourse VII, "Knowledge Viewed in Relation to Professional Skill," he says liberal

"training is the great ordinary means to a great but ordinary end; it aims at raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the national taste, at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixing aims to popular aspiration, at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age, at facilitating the exercise of political power, and refining the intercourse of private life. It is the education which gives a man a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them. It teaches him to see things as they are, to go right to the point, to disentangle a skein of thought, to detect what is sophistical, and to dis-

regard what is irrelevant. It prepares him to fill any post with credit, and to master any subject with facility. It shows him how to accommodate himself to others, how to throw himself into their state of mind, how to bring before them his own, how to influence them, how to come to an understanding with them, how to bear with them. He is at home in any society, he has common ground with every class; he knows when to speak and when to be silent; he is able to converse, he is able to listen; he can ask a question pertinently, and gain a lesson seasonably, when he has nothing to impart himself; he is ever ready, yet never in the way; he is a pleasant companion and a comrade you can depend upon; he knows when to be serious and when to trifle; and he has a sure tact which enables him to trifle with gracefulness and to be serious with effect. He has the repose of a mind which lives in itself, while it lives in the world, and has resources for its happiness at home when it cannot go abroad. He has a gift which serves him in public, and supports him in retirement, without which good fortune is but vulgar, and with which failure and disappointment have a charm. The art which tends to make a man all this, is in the object which it pursues as useful as the art of wealth or the art of health, though it is less susceptible of method, and less tangible, less certain, less complete in its results."

"The great ordinary means to a great but ordinary end." Surely, here is a goal which every student of the liberal college should aim at. Nevertheless, even in the case of those fortunate individuals who succeed in achieving this goal in any adequate degree, they have not thereby received a complete education. Liberal education has its limitations, the same as any other kind of education and we should have clearly in mind what these limitations are.

II. THE LIMITATIONS OF LIBERAL EDUCATION

These limitations are two. In the first place, liberal education does not include professional training. As Newman expresses it in his Discourse, delivered at the opening of the University he founded:

"There is an education necessary and desirable over and above that which may be called professional. Professions differ, and what is an education for one youth is not the education for the other; but there is one kind of education

which all should have in common, and which is distinct from the education which is given to fit each for his profession. It is the education which *makes the man*; it does not make physicians, or surgeons, or engineers, or soldiers, or bankers, or merchants, but it makes *men*. It is that education which enables the man to adorn the place, instead of the place adorning the man. And this is the education for which you especially come to the University—it is *to be made men.*"

This distinction between liberal and professional training does not cause difficulty. The professions themselves aid in making it clear, by demanding before entrance into the professional school, the completion of a period in college devoted to liberal training. It is the second limitation on liberal education, as defined by Newman following Aristotle, which causes trouble, namely, the distinction between liberal training and moral training. Here there has been much muddled thinking and writing and we need Newman's aid to make the concept clear. In his sermon, "Intellect, the Instrument of Religious Training," Newman says:

"The human mind . . . may be regarded from two principal points of view, as intellectual and as moral. As intellectual, it apprehends truth; as moral, it apprehends duty. The perfection of the intellect is called ability and talent; the perfection of our moral nature is virtue. And it is our great misfortune here, and our trial, that, as things are found in the world, the two are separated, and independent of each other; that, where power of intellect is, there need not be virtue; and that where right, and goodness, and moral greatness are, there need not be talent."

This distinction between knowledge and virtue, as outcomes of our mental operations, is absolutely valid. Failure to make this distinction results in intellectual heresy, and by intellectual heresy we mean muddled thinking. Here is another passage from Newman presenting this distinction in his masterful language, from Discourse V, of the *Idea* entitled "Knowledge, Its Own End."

"Knowledge is one thing, virtue is another; good sense is not conscience, refinement is not humility, nor is largeness and justness of view faith. Philosophy, however enlight-

ened, however profound, gives no command over the passions, no influential motives, no vivifying principles. Liberal Education makes not the Christian, . . . but the gentleman. It is well to be a gentleman, it is well to have a cultivated intellect, a delicate taste, a candid, equitable, dispassionate mind, a noble and courteous bearing in the conduct of life;—these are the connatural qualities of a large knowledge; they are the objects of a University; I am advocating, I shall illustrate and insist upon them; but still, I repeat, they are no guarantee for sanctity or even for conscientiousness, they may attach to the man of the world, to the profigate, to the heartless,—pleasant, alas, and attractive as he shows when decked out in them. Taken by themselves, they do but seem to be what they are not. They look like virtue at a distance, but they are detected by close observers, and on the long run; and hence it is that they are popularly accused of pretence and hypocrisy, not, I repeat, from their own fault, but because their professors and admirers persist in taking them for what they are not, and are officious in arrogating for them a praise to which they have no claim. Quarry the graphite rock with razors, or moor the vessel with a thread of silk; then may you hope with such keen and delicate instruments as human knowledge and human reason to contend against those giants, the passion and the pride of man.”

III. THE FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGE

Here we come to the very purpose of the Church-Related College. Liberal Education, of itself, gives knowledge and intellectual power. But, of itself, it does not give any answer to the question: for what shall that knowledge and power be used? In Newman's words, it gives “no command over the passions, no influential motives, no vivifying principles” for the conduct of life. Here is where religion comes in and here is where the Church-Related college finds its place in any scheme of education that is in any sense to be complete. For religion does supply vivifying motives for the conduct of life. Religion means the sum total of those relations which bind man to God—from the Latin, “*religare*,” to bind—God the creator, and therefore the Father of us all, and with Him as Father of us all, we become brothers one of another. From this point of view, there is purpose in life—it is to get back to God, from whom we came, and the route of that journey is service to fellow-man here below that

we may gain heaven and life with God hereafter. If the Church-Related college imbues its students with this principle of life then it performs its function, which is to inform liberal education with religious principle.

IV. THE RELIGIOUS PROGRAM OF THE COLLEGE

How may the Church-Related college hope to do this—*i.e.*, give form to liberal education by infusing it with religious principle? There are three means at its disposal, and any Church-Related college to be true to its purpose must use all three.

First—it will teach religion. The curriculum is the ordinary means through which the school aims to achieve its goal. Since part of its aim is to have its students know God, it will make definite provision for instruction in Religion. The Christian college will teach the Bible, not merely as literature, the great book of the world, but as a message from God to His children leading them back to Him. And then on the higher levels, it will teach Theology, both as part of a Liberal Education (Newman's second Discourse) as well as specific provision for religious knowledge.

In the second place, it will provide opportunity for its students to live their religion. A youth must feel that he has an intimate part to play in the religious life of the institution, if we are to have any hope that religion is to exert an influence in his life after college. This participation in the religious life of the institution will be evidenced, of course, both in private and public worship, that is, worship carried on in common—but it must not be limited to that. Today we are stressing social action programs which are missionary enterprises at home, in addition to those abroad. Further, the disciplinary regulations of the institution should be accepted as interpretations of the Commandments of God applied to the situation where youth are gathered together to advance in growth and development, *i.e.*, in education.

But most important of all, the students of the Church-Related college must live in an atmosphere permeated with the spiritual influence of religion. Atmosphere is created by personalities. Hence, the mature personalities of the administrative and teaching staffs must reveal in their lives this spiritual influence dominating their every action and giving purpose and meaning to

their devotion to their calling. This simply means that youth is more influenced by example than by precept. This was the method of the Divine Teacher in that school in which He trained His Apostles and His first disciples. And this divine ideal—the God-man in the person of Jesus Christ—must be the ideal kept constantly before college students in any education which is entitled to be spoken of as Christian Education.

THE NEWMAN IDEAL IN EDUCATION

That this was the plan of Newman is found only by implication in his great work which describes the scope and the limitations of liberal education. But the fact that he entered upon the task of founding an institution in Ireland, which would do for its students what Oxford was doing for its students in England, namely, giving them a liberal education, at the same time carrying on that task in an institution dominated by the religious motive, shows how well he understood those limitations and how definitely he set about making provisions that these limitations would be provided for. In his sermons, however, he is not silent upon this point and in his first sermon delivered before the student body of the newly organized university, *Intellect, the Instrument of Religious Training*, he sets forth in detail his ideal of education, where what is merely liberal is informed by religious principle.

"Young men feel a consciousness of certain faculties within them which demand exercise, aspirations which must have an object, for which they do not commonly find exercise or object in religious circles. . . . They are not only moral, they are intellectual beings; but, ever since the fall of man, religion is here and philosophy there; each has its own centres of influence, separate from the other; intellectual men desiderate something in the homes of religion; and religious men desiderate something in the schools of science.

"Here, then, I conceive, is the object of the Church in setting up universities; it is to unite things which were in the beginning joined together by God, and have been put asunder by man. Some persons will say that I am thinking of confining, distorting, and stunting the growth of intellect by ecclesiastical supervision. I have no such thought. Nor have I any thought of a compromise, as if

religion must give up something, and science something. I wish the intellect to range with the utmost freedom, and religion to enjoy an equal freedom; but what I am stipulating for is, that *they should be found in one and the same place, and exemplified in the same persons.* I want to destroy that diversity of centres, which puts everything into confusion by creating contrariety of influences. I want the same spots and the same individuals to be at once oracles of philosophy and shrines of devotion. It will not satisfy me, what has satisfied so many, to have two independent systems, intellectual and religious, going at once side by side, by a sort of division of labour and only accidentally brought together. It will not satisfy me, if religion is here, and science there, and young men converse with science all day, and lodge with religion in the evening. It is not touching the evil, to which these remarks have been directed, if the young men eat and drink and sleep in one place, and think in another; I want the *same roof* to contain *both the intellectual and moral discipline.* Devotion is not a sort of finish given to the sciences; nor is science a sort of feather in the cap, if I may so express myself, an ornament and set-off to devotion. *I want the intellectual layman to be religious and the devout ecclesiastic to be intellectual.*

"This is no matter of terms, nor of subtle distinctions. Sanctity has its influence; intellect has its influence; the influence of sanctity is the greater in the long run; the influence of the intellect is the greater at the moment. Therefore, in the case of the young, whose education lasts a few years, where the intellect is, *there* is the influence. Their literary, their scientific teachers really have the forming of them. Let both influences act freely. As a general rule, no system of mere religious guardianship which neglects the Reason will in matter of fact succeed against the school. Youth need a masculine religion, if it is to carry captive their restless imaginations, and their wild intellects, as well as to touch their susceptible hearts."—
(Newman, *Sermons on Various Occasions*, Sermon I.)

Here, then, is stated the very purpose of the Church-Related college. It is "to unite things which were in the beginning joined together by God, and have been put asunder by man." These two things are liberal education, on the one hand, and religious education on the other, the latter alone furnishing vivifying motives for the conduct of life. Some one has stated that the purpose of the American Liberal College is "to preserve and propagate the intellectual tradition." We accept this statement

as true as far as it goes, but it does not include the purpose of the college that is definitely affiliated with the Christian church. The purpose of such a college is "to preserve and propagate the intellectual tradition" of Christian culture. The Liberal College, as part of our great state institutions, the College cut free from all Church affiliation may, through its process of liberal education, produce the cultured individual, but as far as that college is concerned, he is, or may be, a cultured pagan. But the Church-Related college is not content with any such product. Its students must be in the process of becoming and its alumni must in every truth be products of liberal and religious education. In a world that is growing more pagan every day, they are called to play their part in the preservation and the propagation of the intellectual tradition of Christian culture, and to play this part, they themselves must be cultured Christians.

OTTERBEIN CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

The Sixth Annual Conference on Education, under the auspices of the Board of Education of the United Brethren Church, convened at Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio, January 3-4, 1935. Dr. O. T. Deever, General Secretary of the Board of Education, spoke on "Making Education Day Count." President W. J. Clippinger presented some recent trends in college problems. "The Marks of a Christian College" was discussed by a large number of individuals from various points of view, such as the Catalogue, the Church Relationship and Constituency, the Trustees, the Students, the Teachers and Teaching, and the Life on the Campus. A panel discussion on the general topic of "Loyalty, Cooperation, and Good Will" was conducted by Dr. J. Gordon Howard, Secretary of the Young People's Department of the United Brethren Board of Education. The conference concluded by considering what to do about it among the Alumni, the pastors and church people, and the people at large.

CALVIN H. FRENCH—THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE PERSONIFIED*

JAMES E. CLARKE

Member, Board of Christian Education,
The Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

The announced subject, chosen after conference with Dr. Gage, is not meant to imply that the late Calvin H. French was in all respects an ideal college president. He would be the first to protest against any such idealization. Indeed, he often referred to the handicaps of his youth and the stern demands of an executive office as unfitting him for the college presidency in certain particulars, and they did. For instance, he had qualities and capacities which, fully developed, would have placed him in the ranks of noted scholars; but these he was forced to leave undeveloped in order that he might concentrate all of his native powers and all of his experience upon the realization of his vision of what a college should be. He cheerfully made that sacrifice, as he made many other kinds of sacrifice, that he might be true to the calling wherewith he was called. It is just this fact which justifies us in saying that in him the ideals and purposes of a Christian college were personified.

Without time to dwell upon his early years, during which, as the son of a widowed minister's wife, he was compelled to help support a family even while he worked his way through school and college, we begin at the beginning of his college course, when he was already twenty-two years of age, much of his preparation having been in "the school of hard knocks." Entering Lake Forest, he came under the influence of Dr. D. S. Gregory, of whom we may fairly speak as the pioneer in the field of Christian education through Presbyterian colleges.

It is well to recall facts which I set forth rather fully in a paper read before this organization in 1926. Until about the year when Dr. French entered college, the Presbyterian Church officially opposed, instead of encouraged, the type of institution you represent. Indeed, in 1868, the General Assembly went so far as to affirm that the endowment of colleges would be not only

* Paper read at the Annual Meeting, Presbyterian College Union, Atlanta, Ga., January 15, 1935.

"unwise" but "calamitous." But by 1882 Dr. Gregory, supported by Dr. Herrick Johnson, was vigorously advocating that conception of education, and of the relation of the church to a complete educational program, which now prevails among most educational leaders. His argument, greatly condensed, was this: "Education embraces *education* and *instruction*. Its aim . . . is to have men and women thoroughly equipped in power and character for the work of life. . . . Power may be wasted, may work destruction, unless properly controlled and guided. And so we must have our education made Christian." He insisted that there must be not only moral instruction but also something which seems to have been all too generally forgotten in recent days, namely: "A *power* must be provided adequately to transform and bring a people, in their conduct, up to this standard. This requires, not religious training and instruction simply, but the transforming efficiency of the divine power." His conclusion was that this "important element" must come mainly from Christian schools.

Calvin French entered upon his life work as an educator deeply convinced of the truth in the words just quoted and, to him, everything else was considered a means to this high end. My most intimate association with him was during the years when we served together as associate secretaries of the old College Board. Indeed, Mr. L. H. Severance and I, then members of that board, had urged that Dr. French be called as a secretary, partly because of his experience and knowledge of the needs of the West, but mainly because we were both convinced that no man had a clearer vision of what the Christian college was for. If my memory is not astray, I actually became a part-time secretary before Dr. French finally joined the staff, and I have often wondered what the college leaders of that day thought of having two men of such apparently opposite types and temperaments. Outwardly two could scarcely have been more different—I need not pause to catalogue those differences, which some of you saw so clearly—but, under the surface, we were bound together by a common conviction and ideal so dominating that there was never a moment when we found ourselves at cross purposes. I was but an "outsider." I had never been a college executive of any sort. But Dr. French came from the inside, with a rare wealth of experience, and because of his

conviction and experience the Christian college was personified in him as in no man I have ever known. Let us consider his attitude more in detail:

1. First of all, Dr. French had a keen consciousness of what honesty demands and insisted that an institution calling itself a college must be a college in fact. He began work when academic standards were lower than today, but he not only tackled the task of being up to standard but contributed much to the general elevation of college standards. Time forbids any elaboration of this characteristic, but it appears very strikingly in many written words he left us, particularly in his important publication, "The Efficient College." Therein he dealt almost exclusively with financial and academic type of efficiency without which a real college might not be classified as a Christian college.

2. In the second place, he believed profoundly that in the last analysis this business of a complete education is what we may call a hand-picking business. He emphasized the importance of a well organized faculty dominated by a definite purpose and a common spirit, working in a thoroughly equipped and well endowed plant; but all the while he held to the conviction that the supreme essential was the right relationship between the proper kind of teacher and the immature personality to be developed by the educational process. Compelled to choose, he would have taken the log with a Mark Hopkins at one end and a boy at the other, rather than the most thoroughly equipped and endowed institution where was lacking the consciousness that the factor of prime importance was the impact of a rich and matured Christian personality upon vigorous, daring, idealistic but inexperienced youth. Indeed, his own method was the individualistic method. He did not think of dominating crowds but of developing individuals. He was constrained to withdraw from the multitude, but he might be found almost any day or night sitting by a well with some perplexed person representing the common people, or on a housetop with some ruler among men, in either case quietly, patiently leading the individual toward life. And that, by the way, was the method which brought him such unusual success in providing for the financial needs of a college—not by eloquent appeals to great audiences, but by the exposure of his own heart's interest and conviction

to the sympathetic light in the eyes of a single listener until his vision was photographed on the heart of the other.

3. Again, Dr. French believed heartily in the obligation of a college as a whole, and of each individual unit in that college, to the community in which it was located. It was there, in his view, not to be ministered unto but to minister, and in a much larger way than just to the economic welfare of the community. He expected his community to help, and it always did help—the more readily, no doubt, because his appeal was not primarily to selfish interest but to the opportunity to serve. That is not always the case. There was given me recently a booklet which outlined in a masterly manner the benefits to a community derived from the existence of an important college in its midst. It set forth the financial and cultural benefits, but said nothing of the far greater spiritual benefits which flow from the right kind of an educational institution. Dr. French would never have overlooked that supreme contribution to the welfare of the people. This remark leads to my fourth observation, which more than any other reveals the man as the personification of the Christian college.

4. He cherished the deep-seated conviction that the Christian college had a specific job which included what we call "secular education" but reached far beyond its range; and in his quiet way he always succeeded in imparting this conviction to those closely associated with him.

That conviction does not always exist. I can never forget one experience. I visited a college where everybody knew something was wrong, but nobody seemed to know what. After some inquiries, I met with the faculty and began the conference in a somewhat unusual and what must have seemed a presumptuous manner, paving the way by the jocular remark that I would like the privilege of giving them a dose of the same kind of medicine they sometimes gave their students. Then I distributed slips of paper, asking that, upon hearing a question, each would write down immediately that answer which came first into mind, without waiting for any "sober second thought." This was the question: "What is the primary purpose of this college?" The answers revealed amazing variety and only one out of about twenty-five would pass muster in this group.

It seemed quite apparent that that college was in no sense an

organism. Its faculty was made up of good and capable persons, but each seemed to be traveling an independent path. That could never have happened where Dr. French was leading. Of course, sometimes he made mistakes in choosing workers, as all college presidents do; but misfits were soon discovered and changes made and as a rule the dominant purpose of its leader was the dominant purpose of the college. It functioned as an organism, practically every part under the sway of a common spirit and ideal—a spirit and an ideal definitely Christian. With all of his insistence upon "efficiency" as that word is commonly used, our departed friend thought of efficiency merely as a means to an end; and the end ever in view was to develop well trained men and women who would go forth to give their lives in the service of their fellows, under the guidance and in the power of the Spirit of Christ.

The Christian concept of the meaning of life was never overshadowed for him. It was carried into every detail of his varied duties. Just a few weeks ago I was talking with a friend who was at Huron under his leadership as student and teacher for thirteen years. In commenting upon his passing, she quoted from a paper she had read at the college years ago: "He added divinity to the commonplace." Such was the impression he made upon young life, and all who knew him recall his emphasis upon the making of missionaries and how he rejoiced in the many who had gone forth from college for such sacrificial service at home and abroad.

As an educator, his constant purpose was to send forth men and women of that spirit, fully equipped for the tasks before them. He had that conception of true education which to my mind was never better expressed than by Huxley: "Education is the instruction of the intellect in the laws of Nature, under which I include not only things and their forces but men and their ways, *and* the fashioning of the affections and will into an earnest and loving desire to move in harmony with those laws." Dr. French believed deeply that the latter part of that old definition was an essential of all complete education and that to emphasize it was what makes the Christian college distinctive.

If ever such emphasis was needed, it is surely needed today. Only last week Roger W. Babson sounded again a note which has become familiar: "The crying need of today is not more

education along cultural lines, but in the spiritual sphere. Our standard of living will collapse of its own weight unless our spiritual growth catches up with our material growth." In the direction of supplying this need is the movement started in Washington, D. C., under the leadership of Dr. Frank W. Ballou, Superintendent of Schools, for an experiment in character education in the schools of the nation's capital. Why such a movement? Because of the conviction expressed by Dr. Ballou before Washington ministers on September 24, 1934, that present day education is inadequate to the needs of the times. Inadequate how? Because it has failed to inculcate "in the hearts and minds of young people the compelling ideals of conduct which shall control their thoughts and actions," and so has failed to produce a truly efficient citizenship. With such efforts being made outside of church institutions, it is surely high time that all Christian colleges were dominated by the spirit and purpose which controlled our beloved friend. They should lead the way toward providing what the nation most needs—men and women of high training whose affections and wills are fully developed into an earnest and loving desire to move in harmony with the laws of God.

5. One final thought: Dr. French was a man with a keen sense of a God-given mission. From his college days it controlled his life. Before that time, his object was so to prepare himself that he might care for a family which had known nothing but struggle. For that purpose he wanted to become able to make money that he might ease burdened lives. But with the decision to enter the ministry he deliberately sacrificed the chance to make money, and he knew it. But that was not his only sacrifice. All the way along the rough and heroic road he followed, appeared other calls for sacrifice. He made the sacrifices and kept straight on! We have heard of times when he went apart to pray. What happened at those times? I do not know. I doubt that he ever told anyone. Yet I have good reason to believe that many of those hours were hours of intense struggle, for there came to him opportunities for what promised to be easier living. Probably he was sorely tempted more than once; but he never yielded. He kept right on in the task to which he felt he had been called; and that fact, perhaps more than any other, explains his life.

I recall an incident in the life of Him who is our Supreme Leader which is much like what I feel sure happened more than once with Calvin H. French; and in this sacred fellowship I would reverently associate the two, because I think experiences were similar, and because the reminder may bring new strength to some of you.

Near the close of the Master's life, among those who came up to Jerusalem for the feast were certain Greeks who sought an interview with Jesus. We do not know what they wanted. We are not even sure that the interview was granted. But it is perfectly clear that something happened to raise again with Jesus the question whether he should continue along his appointed path or turn aside for some different type of service. He had come to do his Father's will. His special mission was to "the lost sheep of the House of Israel." But he knew that he was to be accounted a failure in that particular. By his own, he was despised and rejected. I have wondered if this was not the question—perhaps arising in his own mind, perhaps put to him by the Greeks: "These Jews do not appreciate you, Teacher. They will not listen. They are breaking your heart. Come with us. We will gladly sit at your feet or follow you in the corridors of our schools. We will show you respect and give you a chance. Why not leave Jerusalem and go to Greece?"

However the issue appeared, Jesus at once began that memorable teaching about the grain of wheat which must fall into the ground and die if it is not to remain alone, and then follows the story of an acute spiritual struggle as he contemplated what lay just before: "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But," he thought, "but for this cause came I unto this hour." For the very death before me I have come this far. Shall I turn from my mission to men? "What shall I say?" Well, what did he say? This was it: "Father, glorify Thy name!" Then came a voice in reply: "I have both glorified it and will glorify it again."

I think, brethren, that our departed friend heard a voice like that. I think that we may hear it too, if only, like he, we resist that pressure to conform to popular demands and pursue, unfalteringly and unafraid, the path marked out for us—the path consecrated by Him who was and is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

THE CHURCH'S REAL PROBLEM IN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

F. L. PICKETT

Dean, The Graduate School
The State College of Washington

The ability of the Christian churches to hold a place of leadership, and to carry forward successfully their program of betterment depends very largely upon their ability to hold the respect, sympathy and active support of a rapidly increasing public of college-trained men and women. Such men and women are the leaders in American social, industrial, political and educational life, and they determine in a large measure the customs and ideals of their communities. If these leaders are to be interested in the churches' objectives and program they must be trained in their respective fields of work under the direction and influence of the churches. It is unreasonable to expect men and women to spend from eight to twenty years in training—from elementary grade school through college, technical or professional school—in institutions where the churches have no direct control or positive influence and in daily contact with teachers many of whom are indifferent or antagonistic to the churches and their work, and then to go out into life as eager, aggressive and capable workers in their community churches. This was a problem when trained leaders were few and limited almost wholly to the "learned professions." It has become a much greater and more serious problem with the increase in the opportunities for leadership in widely different fields that has resulted from the complexity and high specialization of modern American life. The seriousness of the problem is further increased by the constantly growing demand for a high degree of training in many industrial fields. Today few workers on the farm or in the factory, shop, bank or mercantile establishment can expect to reach positions of influence without a college education or its equivalent in time and energy spent at a technical or professional school.

American churches have been faced with a group of serious problems within the last few years that seem to be definitely related to the changes in social and economic organization and to

the new leadership just described. Among these problems may be named greatly reduced income, curtailment of missionary programs, waning enthusiasm on the part of members, inability to increase numbers in proportion to the general increase in population, lethargy of people toward major programs of betterment and reform. Many remedies have been suggested. Old treatments have been more or less fully revised, but no noticeable cures have been effected. It is possible that the difficulty has not been studied with sufficient care for a proper diagnosis, that remedies are being applied to alleviate symptoms instead of treatments to remove the fundamental cause or causes of disturbance.

From early colonial days in America the Christian churches have felt that an educated leadership was essential to healthy social, political, economical and moral development of the people, and they have followed a fairly definite program in their attempts to provide such educated, Christian leadership. As indicated in the first paragraph, the fields in which such leadership may be exercised have increased in number, especially so within the last half century; and with that increase have come changes in the type and agencies for training. The following brief tables show a group of conditions which, although unthought of by the founders of the prevailing system of Christian Education, must be considered carefully today in any study of plans for securing an educated, Christian leadership. They must be considered seriously by any student of the major problems now confronting the Christian churches.

In the school year 1929-30 more than 90% of the more than 23,000,000 pupils in elementary schools in the United States were attending public, tax-supported schools. In the same year 92.2% of the 4,800,000 pupils in secondary schools were attending public, tax-supported schools. Direct religious instruction is given in very few public schools. The most important factor in these schools, as far as moral and religious training are concerned, is the attitude of the teachers. Sympathy on the part of the teacher toward the churches and other agencies for community welfare leaves pupils with minds open to teaching and suggestion by these agencies. Adverse suggestion, the occasional disparaging remark or even indifference from public-school teachers set the schools and churches in positions of opposition in students'

thinking and make the churches' task much more difficult. So, in many public schools, even though *positive* religious instruction may not be given, there is no hindrance to the giving of anti-religious teaching by either direct statement or suggestion. In the public schools is a major problem of Christian education to-day. Its solution is tied up with the training of teachers and will be discussed later.

Students of college grade in the same year were enrolled as follows:

In tax-supported institutions	644,657	52.9%
In independent private institutions	257,693	21.1%
Total	902,350	74.0%
In church-related colleges (500 or less students)...	112,828	9.3%
In church-related colleges (501-1000 students)	49,820	4.0%
In larger church-related institutions	154,029	12.7%
Total	316,677	26.0%
Grand total	1,219,027	100.0%

In the conditions represented by these figures lies another major problem for serious students of Christian education. When the enrolments are analyzed with respect to different fields the figures become much more significant.

	<i>Law</i>	<i>Commerce</i>	<i>Medicine</i>	<i>Engineering</i>
At tax-supported institutions	7,314	36,466	9,397	48,884
Independent institutions	19,653	20,799	8,719	18,413
At institutions not related to churches	26,967 68.4%	57,265 73%	18,116 80.2%	67,297 90.9%
At Protestant.....	5,357 13.7%	12,510 16%	2,389 10.6%	4,372 5.9%
At Roman Catholic	7,085 17.9%	8,636 11%	2,095 9.2%	2,339 3.2%
At inst. related to churches	12,442 31.6%	21,146 27%	4,484 19.8%	6,711 9.1%
Total	39,409	78,411	22,600	74,008

The present discussion is not intended to suggest comparisons between church groups, but for the benefit of workers who may be interested in the work of the Roman Catholic church and the

group of Protestant churches in technical and professional fields the totals have been divided and individual percentages indicated. It would seem to be a reason for congratulation to interested Roman Catholic workers that while only 7% of all students enrolled at institutions of higher learning were at institutions related to that church, 9.2% of medical students, 11% of commercial students, 17.9% of law students were enrolled at Roman Catholic schools.

The facts given above really need but little discussion. If it be taken for granted that various churches exercise suitable and effective influence through their various professional schools to insure their graduates becoming Christian leaders (!), the overwhelming majority of such graduates of institutions over which the churches have no control suggests that actual leadership in the various fields is to be found with them. The situation is made more important by the fact that at least four-fifths of these students come from homes affiliated with various churches, young people who would become supporters of those churches by personal services and by financial gifts if they could be kept in sympathetic touch with the churches' programs and needs. Here is a problem that cannot be solved by any of the old formulae. Those students cannot all be sent to church-related schools. Not even the students from Christian homes can be accommodated by the "small Christian college," as has been often advised. The small church-related schools are not equipped to offer other than "pre-professional" courses. They have not facilities for caring for more than a handful of undergraduate students. The professional schools affiliated with the church-related universities cannot possibly care for the students who normally attend the tax-supported and independent institutions. Some other means of maintaining a vital and effective contact with the professional students must be found.

The conditions in four important fields of work have been shown in detail. Similar conditions regularly exist in other fields. Almost all prospective leaders in various agricultural lines, more than 95% of prospective school teachers, more than 70% of the prospective, college-trained housewives and home makers, and more than 75% of students who were in training for research work and for teaching and administrative work in

colleges and universities are enrolled at tax-supported and other institutions in no way related to churches. At least two of these groups deserve special attention.

Prospective teachers to the number of 323,182 were taking teacher-training courses in the year 1929-30. Their enrolment at various institutions was as follows:

At tax-supported and independent normal schools.....	263,175	81.5%
At tax-supported and independent colleges and universities	48,945	15.1%
	312,120	96.6%
At church-related normal schools	1,107	0.3%
At other church-related institutions	9,955	3.1%
	11,062	3.4%

From the standpoint of effective Christian education that may lead toward a coordination of all positive forces for betterment there is probably no more important problem than that of securing public school teachers who are sympathetic with the aims and purposes of the Christian churches. This is emphasized by the fact presented in an earlier paragraph that more than 90% of elementary and high school pupils attend public schools, in most of which no religious teaching is allowed. In the face of this important need the churches have left teacher-training more completely than any other field except the training of the Christian ministry, to publicly controlled institutions. With more than 95% of the teachers in elementary and secondary schools being trained in institutions in no way related to any church, and in many of which religious teaching is forbidden, there are some individuals who maintain that all is well with our educational world and that church-related schools alone will keep it safe through furnishing teachers! The only way American schools may be supplied with Christian teachers is through some plan that will make Christian churches and Christian teachings effective in the environment where young people are being trained for teaching, *i.e.*, in the tax-supported and other non-church-related institutions. In this statement, as in other similar statements favoring the increase of the churches' influence, it must be clearly understood that the writer is not suggesting or

favoring increased church control of educational institutions. Rather is the need for Christian influence in the lives of the students being urged. Tax-supported, public schools of all grades are essential in the American form of government and social organization. Through such schools the state offers secular education and training, and thereby challenges the Christian churches to supplement that offering with equally thorough preparation in moral and spiritual things. The writer is earnestly urging the churches to accept the challenge.

One other situation deserves careful attention. Certain types of institutions, through their graduate work, have come to wield great influence in determining educational policies, objectives and standards. This is clearly shown by the academic records of 530 presidents of colleges and universities. The institutions were of all the types under consideration in this discussion. The selection was made on the basis of whether or not the presidents' records appeared either in *Who's Who in America* or in *Leaders in Education*. The records show that of the advanced degrees (excluding all honorary degrees) held by the college presidents 63% had been granted by institutions not related to churches and that 73% of the Doctors' degrees represented were from such institutions. The records also show that although 52% of the college presidents held Bachelors' degrees from church-related schools, only 9% of the presidents of non-church-related schools held Doctors' degrees from church-related schools, and 58% of the Doctors' degrees held by presidents of church-related schools had been granted by non-related institutions. A study of the records of college professors also shows a marked predominance of advanced degrees from independent and tax-supported institutions. This is particularly noticeable in the fields of biology, education, psychology, and sociology. Since these are the fields in which most controversy and possible misunderstanding between the church and modern teachers is liable to occur the fact just pointed out has more than ordinary significance. Not only are public and independent schools furnishing leaders in these fields to institutions of their own group, but to church-related schools as well. In 1929-30 78.5% of the total graduate enrollment was at tax-supported and independent schools. It seems evident that churches will never again hold a place of major im-

portance in determining educational policies and emphasis unless they can secure the sympathetic interest of leaders-to-be who are in training in the graduate schools of such institutions. In no other way can there be secured with certainty instructors, professors and school executives who will be actively sympathetic toward the churches and their work.

Churches have not been entirely blind to the need of maintaining contact with students in institutions of higher education which are in no way under their control. One of the most interesting chapters in the history of Christian education is that dealing with the selection of special workers, the development of organizations and the establishment of foundations to care for the spiritual needs of students at public, tax-supported colleges and universities. For a time these movements developed rapidly and promised splendid results. With the coming of economic difficulties this, the youngest missionary project, has been in most cases the first to suffer. At no time has the movement been able to furnish means and workers sufficient for the task proposed. With income greatly reduced and in some places completely withdrawn the interests of the churches are now without official representatives in some centers, and they are represented in others by devoted pastors and a handful of laymen only. These pastors, many carrying the double load of local parish duties and the student responsibility without even clerical help, stand between their churches and the imminent loss of student interest. They hold the most critical position in the field of Christian education to-day. Presidents of colleges and universities founded by churches and in some measure, at least, controlled by those churches are finding it necessary to use specially trained workers to make contact with students and to develop a suitable religious influence and atmosphere. If such measures are necessary in schools whose officials and faculty have been chosen on the basis of their Christian personality as well as academic ability how much greater must be the need in institutions not in any way controlled by the church!

Perhaps if the efforts of all the churches could be united in a common program and purpose the work could be given such impulse, dignity and evident value as to demand the attention and respect of both students and faculty in the college community.

In a few places such united efforts have met with marked success. In a very few places individual churches have been able to bring together sufficient funds and talent to make their programs fairly successful. But, in a great many places the various churches, working alone and with hardly sufficient means and equipment for a purely local parish program, have miserably failed in their attempts to make the church an effective factor in the lives of students.

Even more surprising than the failure of various churches to unite in a program of student approach is the failure of workers in various fields of Christian education in individual church organizations to get together in the development of unified programs for their respective churches. If the development of an educated Christian leadership not only in the professions but in commerce and industry so as to assure a sufficient lay support for the church's work is desirable, nothing seems more natural or more easily brought about than a correlation of the efforts of the leaders in Christian training within each church. Such has not been the case. Vigorous opposition to the development of student work in publicly controlled colleges and universities has come from workers in church-related institutions. Such opposition has developed especially when the new student work could not proceed without a division of educational funds. Perhaps it has been one of the not unusual cases in which the maintenance of an institution founded for the development of Christian leaders has in itself become more important than the purpose for which it was founded. Rather than being cause for such divided effort this problem seems a call for united effort. There should be no reason for antagonism between established institutions and the work at institutions not related to churches. The task ahead will require all that can possibly be done through the splendid, loyal Christian colleges—and much more.

If the churches can afford to have their programs so far curtailed as to be supported wholly or in large measure by the students and alumni of small, church-related colleges, they may continue nicely with present methods; but if their programs are so far reaching as to require the personal service as well as the moral and financial support of the farmers, mechanics, engineers, housewives, musicians, merchants, bankers, business men,

lawyers, doctors, teachers and others who are attending independent and public institutions preparing themselves for successful careers, then the churches must find some means to keep in sympathetic contact with those students as well as with those at church-related institutions both small and large. *To make sure of a sufficient number of well-trained Christian leaders in various fields it will be necessary to make effective contact with those leaders wherever they are being trained.* This is the outstanding problem facing serious students of Christian education. It is one of the major problems, perhaps the greatest problem, facing the leaders, prophets, statesmen of the churches today.

Note: Most of the data in this discussion were published in *School and Society*, Sept. 30, 1933, pp. 444-448. For the benefit of those who have not read that article it may be pointed out that the investigation reported in it included 1,228 institutions of higher learning (colleges, universities, teachers colleges, and normal schools), with an aggregate enrolment of 1,219,027 students. Enrolment figures were obtained from bulletins issued by the Federal Office of Education in all but a very few cases, and in those cases the figures were obtained from the Christian Education Handbook or from reports to accrediting agencies. The relationship of the institutions to various churches was determined by consulting published reports of the boards of education of the churches, reports to accrediting agencies, college catalogues, and from questionnaires returned by individual schools. Wherever a valid relationship was found, whether it be of a legal nature or merely a long-standing mutually recognized cooperation between church and school, that institution was included in the church-related group.

METHODS OF COUNSELING USED BY THE UNIVERSITY PASTOR*

ROY A. BURKHART

Associate Director of Young People's Work, The International
Council of Religious Education

College young people, as well as other groups of people, are influenced by the impersonal aspects of our world. They become a part of a group in which they are especially sensitive to group standards and group mores. They are a part of the traditional system in which growth is measured in terms of the ability of the student to give what the professor expects. On many campuses, students have very few people to whom they can go in getting help on difficult problems of personal and social adjustment. The tendency is to go along from day to day either making or not making the educational and social grades, without doing very much at the important job of reconditioning habit systems.

These students come to college with certain ideals. At college other ideals are often substituted. Ambitions are stimulated. But habit systems very often fail to give support to these ideals and ambitions. It is possible for a student to go through four years of college or university work with his ideals and viewpoints fundamentally changed but without gaining any help in the reorganization of his habit system.

It seems to me that the college student has some very definite needs that can be supplied by the university pastor. They may be listed as follows:

1. A friend with whom he can chat casually and sometimes seriously about his personal concerns.
2. A counseling friend who can give him continuous help over a sufficient period in making adjustments.
3. A social group where he can find support for the ideals that he cherishes most highly and which he can have a sense of helping to sustain. The student with an undernourished personality, or who does not make friends readily, who is never elected to an

* Adapted in abbreviated form from a chapter of a book by Mr. Burkhardt, *Guiding Industrial Growth*, to be published March 1st by the Abingdon Press, and presented to the Conference of Church Workers in Universities, Evanston, Illinois, January 2-4, 1935.

office or is seldom invited to join a fraternity or sorority, may need this more than the other type of student.

4. He needs an opportunity to keep his spiritual flames burning. His spiritual life needs feeding and nurturing. Unless the college or university church group can provide this nurturing, the student may be lost in the storms of irreligion which blow over most campuses.

By what methods of counseling can the university pastor help the college student meet these needs? We shall list these methods.

1. The casual chat.

Very often just a casual chat with a student will have as much meaning as anything else. This conversation may be carried on while the pastor and the student are working at some project in connection with the church's program. The pastor may be coaching the student in some leadership task or they may just be sitting in front of a fire place, or walking to some other meeting. These passing moments of friendliness may provide the medium of exchange between two personalities which will have lasting influence for good in the life of the student.

Of course, the pastor must not be too conscious of this opportunity else his fellowship with the student will not be natural. He will help the student more perhaps, when he is not trying to do so. At those times, when he is enjoying the friendship of the student, being a friend to him, working with him, he will perhaps accomplish the most for the student.

2. The formal interview.

Every pastor, of course, ought to have times when he can sit down with a student to work on a specific problem. It may be a case in which the student comes to the pastor with his problem, or in which the pastor seeks out the student to confer about a given issue. In this latter case, the pastor must discover ways by which he can win rapport. He is never a detective. He is always a friendly helper.

3. Counseling through the group technique.

This is perhaps as important as any. We may look at this method in two ways. One way may be through the informal social times the group spends with the pastor. It may be an

informal chat around the fire place when there is no docket. It may be what some one as termed, a "glorified bull session." The individual raises a question and the group looks for a solution. Different individuals make their suggestions. The pastor may offer his. There is no effort to come to any fundamental decision, but the individual goes out with the ideas of the members of this group, of which he is a part, as his own possession. Another way of using this method is in the regular work of the group as they discuss various problems and interests. It is the pastor's task to see that the program is so geared and blocked out that it takes into account the specific needs and interests of all the individuals in the group. Thus he must know his people. If the group can discuss some problem like inferiority, and through that discussion a sound solution can be reached, then chances are that it will do the individual more good than if that same solution had been reached in a personal interview. This, of course, may not be true of all cases but in many it will be. There is no doubt but that the group technique provides a subtle approach in helping individual students.

4. *Counseling by letter.*

There may be times when the pastor may write a letter to a given student. In the letter he might ask for an interview by raising questions or making suggestions which will start the student thinking. Letters have great possibility. Some university pastors write letters regularly to all their students. Even though they are mimeographed, they may be helpful. After all, students do not receive nearly as many mimeographed letters as do pastors.

Whatever the method, the university pastor must have within his own personality and in his total outlook in life, those qualities and traits which will make it possible for him to win the confidence of the student and thus be approachable. If he can do no more than be a real loyal helpful friend, he will make a real contribution as a counselor.

TO THOSE MINISTERING TO STUDENTS

THEODORE O. WEDEL

Secretary, College Work, The National Council,
The Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A.

(Editor's Note: The following letter, under date of January 28, 1935, is so interesting and its point of view so fundamental, that we believe it deserves a larger circulation. While written for those serving students of the Episcopal Church, the suggestions are valuable for all workers with students. With Dr. Wedel's consent there are a few deletions which do not interfere with the thought.)

When I first looked at my office desk a year ago, I wondered what there was to do for a College Secretary. Tasks seemed vague, and objectives cloudy. After a trial of months, I now confess to being swamped. To play the part of ecclesiastical hobo is alone beyond one man's power. And "visitations" may be of least importance in my list of duties. They can even be merely annoying—to the victims. Certainly one could say of some secretaries what was said of a college professor overly given to athletics: "The professor should be indoors more." But my recent runnings to and from in the Middle and Far West have given me my first glimpse of college work as a whole. Educating a new College Secretary takes time. If I present in this letter a few observations on our common problems, they must be received as very tentative.

To judge by the most frequent requests on the part of the student pastors that I have met, the call is first of all for advice on organizational problems—a cry for devices and techniques. This is only natural. Just what shall we *do* in this our baffling job? One has to understand the patient first, and that is slow business. It may be of greater value to do some thinking on the philosophy of student work first, to clarify objectives, to find a thought-way through the problem—a task which a former college professor finds, perhaps, only too much to his liking. I shall give you, however, at least one attempt at a survey of the scene as I see it tentatively now.

I begin with a naive observation. I was surprised to find in my travels from place to place that the Corporate Communion

was apparently the one most successful communal gathering everywhere. Or, to put it in an even more impregnable form, students are more willing to "go to Church" than they are to attend any other form of meeting. The Episcopal Group Dance —once the great institutional symbol of our anti-Puritan *mores*—has fallen, indeed, on difficult days. Discussion classes, dramatic societies, supper clubs have to fight for life. But Church attendance holds up remarkably well, particularly when one considers the fact that students are free not to come, and must fit Church-going into a schedule which puts a three-ringed circus utterly to shame.

Now this simple observation can lead, I think, to some far-reaching conclusions, transcending mere self-congratulation. Explaining goodness is often quite as difficult as explaining evil. It won't do, for example, to ascribe student Church attendance to early habit. How many young people of 18 in our parishes voluntarily attend service? The brilliance of our sermons hardly accounts for it fully either. Furthermore, you cannot make the claim that our "cultus" has, on its intellectual side, a strikingly "modern" appeal. The Prayer-Book has not been rewritten in the vocabulary of John Dewey or of our Chicago University sociologists. Nor would I be foolish enough to suggest that its power lies in traditional language as such, though I do believe that hunger for the timeless democracy of tradition is an instinct in human nature much underrated in our days. But what about the reality behind that vocabulary? What about the full-blown faith of historic Christendom as it stands forth in the Communion Service or the Canticles of the time-worn prayers? Here is confession of sin and absolution, here is allusion to a "service which is perfect freedom," here is the drum-roll of the Christian creed, that gospel of a cosmic drama of salvation in the light of which mere polite toying with human ethics seems idle presumption; here is transcendent God coming down into a lost and troubled world and "really present" in a great mystery; here, in a word, is God and not Man, He "that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us."

If the liturgical services of the Church are our chief weapon, isn't this just the point—that it has a power, coming among us,

which we do not fully value. God may be doing our work better than we are. Here is sacramental grace—and I am not limiting it narrowly to one or two mysteries either. It is working, to be sure, under handicaps. Traditional vocabulary does need interpretation. Philosophical approaches need to be hewn out to furnish an understanding for the great Christian view on life. The powerful rival philosophies of the modern world need to be confronted and argued down. Apology must be made for a belief in God and a divine Incarnation. The Church must be understood, its history, its social genius, its mission in the world of money and war and culture. The personal religious life of the student needs training and underpinning, apart from the liturgical services of the Church. There must be evangelism and prophecy as well as priestly routine. But the marvel still is that even without the aids of Religious Education, the Church with her timeless Faith, unbuttressed by much that is needful, is her own best apologist. Her genius is greater than we know. The Prayer-Book can outrival the eloquence of preaching or the classroom, as it can outrival that of H. L. Mencken or Bertrand Russell. Its majestic phrases appeal to something deep in the heart.

Our auxiliary activities may not be quite so important as we think, or may lose effectiveness because they are too much at a tangent from what may after all be a student's main hunger—religion itself. If God through the Church is the thing of power, isn't our task in our student work machinery to take that power out of the vacuum in which we sometimes leave it? Of course, every activity—a social party, a lecture on Mesopotamian archaeology, a secular visit to a fraternity house, a dramatic society performance, or what you will—can be made to serve this great end. But we are tempted sometimes, I believe, into thinking that there is peculiar merit in getting as far as possible from anything specifically "religious," that making the Christian influence felt on the periphery of a student's interest is more effective than playing close to home base, that getting down on the level of the student's everyday life is the only way to capture him. The warning contained in the famous phrase of Emerson—"we descend to meet"—applies to the making of student contacts as well as elsewhere. We are discovering at

times that some of our activities are being better done in the University Union, or in the college theatre than they are with us. And we may occasionally be surprised to find how a direct shot takes better than one at an oblique angle. Our Episcopal students are, for the most part, not socially starved. Some of the more underprivileged, to be sure, need social stimulation, and a valuable service can be rendered them through the Parish Hall or the Rectory. There is great merit, surely, in Christian fellowship on any level, and to answer such needs is part of our job. But to carry coals to Newcastle can become futile, and may even give offense.

One of our college pastors, for example, tells his student group frankly that not an hour's time is going to be devoted by himself or his secretary to promotion of dances or parties, though the facilities of the Church are at their disposal. He himself is unusually successful in personal interviews and instructional groups. Paradoxically enough, the social activities are in a flourishing state—a happy by-product, however, and not a main show. Promotional effort is spared for other things. I am citing this example, not as a model to be followed, but as an illustration of a principle. If we view our problem as one of hitting the bull's-eye rather than the edge of the target, we may choose one technique rather than another. Take the personal interview, if you like. It is as direct as anything can be. Getting a student into the pastor's study should not always be beyond our power of tact. Indeed, why shouldn't a student be asked to see his "parish priest" as well as the college dean? There are endless possibilities in a conversation which opens with the question: "What is college life doing to your religion?" At least you have the student on your own ground. And a considerable experience of my own points to the conviction that a direct hit is more appreciated than we often suppose. Young people do have a canny capacity for suspecting the least trace of "fawning" and stalking one's prey. There is surely no reason against trying the direct method with groups as well as individuals—a dozen students, for instance, invited to the Rectory for an evening. A parish priest in one of our large city churches tells me that parish group meetings, arranged by appointment, and not for tea or cocktails or gossip about the children, but

for serious presentation of the Church's problems, for a class in "apologetics," in short, is proving to be remarkably successful.

At any rate, I suggest once again that to release the Church's own sacramental power from its vacuum is our first auxiliary need. And we represent the Church as missionaries in an educational environment. The missionary to China must interpret Christianity to the Chinese. We must interpret it to young men and women living in a whirlwind of books and lectures—on Biology and Shakespeare, on Economics and Kant. They are "fed-up" on learning. Hence an attempt to inject Religious Education into the schedule may seem once more like carrying coals to Newcastle. Yet here is something, unlike student social life, which cannot be turned over to the University Union or to the fraternity houses. Religious Education is desperately needed, and only we can do it. Be the non-intellectual appeal of our worship-services or our stimulation of what we loosely call "personal religion" ever so effective, it can easily get snowed under. The parable of the seed being choked by weeds applies neatly to the student (surely not that of the stony ground). An admiration for more undoctrinal religion, for Christianity merely as a "way of life," whatever may be said for it elsewhere is likely to lead to disillusioning results on the college campus. Was not this, in fact, the weakness of the evangelicalism—lovely and full of grace as it was when it could still live on sufficient doctrinal capital—of the Y. M. C. A. in its "religious" days? Isn't this what is wrong with the increasingly "humanistic" social religion of some of our sister Protestant communions? Isn't this (and I might as well put it) what is wrong with what is technically known as Liberal Protestantism anyway? I realize that I seem to be touching on dangerous controversial matters in the perennial strife of tongues in the matter of Churchmanship. But it isn't party controversy that I am after. The full doctrinal Christianity that I believe is needed in combating the scepticism of our age can be the conviction of the Low Churchman who fears candles on the altar as much as that of the highest of High Churchmen who thinks that the Kingdom of God must come with chasubles and birettas. And for it, I think, we should be willing unitedly to suffer martyrdom

if need be. In it lies our strength and our glory. In it lies our astounding opportunity.

The problem as to what our Christian gospel really is, as it confronts the flaming ramparts of this contemporary world, is, I believe, not secondary but primary, and does transcend all our debatings on techniques, helpful as these are in their rightful place. Clearly, it costs something, in a proud academic community, to bear the "reproach of the Church" and to preach the "foolishness of the Cross." And there are great truths to be fought for. One way of stating what is perhaps the most important issue in the religious life of our time is in the words of Canon F. R. Barry, in his great book on Apologetics, *Christianity and the New World*.

"Admiration for 'the way of Jesus,'" says Canon Barry, "is not the centre of Christianity, nor can it carry the weight of Christian living. There are many outside any Christian affiliation who acknowledge Christ as their example and the embodiment of their best ideals, who remain confessedly agnostic about the character or existence of God. To revere Christ's character is a precious thing, but it is not the religion of Christians. Christianity is the worship of the Father, the vision of God as revealed in Christ. For the modern mind this is the crucial difficulty. Nearly all the forces that play upon us conspire to make belief in God difficult. In the old world every one believed in God: that is perhaps the most signal difference between ancient and modern history. The task of the earliest Christian preachers was to persuade men who believed in God to accept Christ's interpretation of Him. The task of the Church today is almost the opposite: to help people who at different levels and in various degrees believe in Christ to win to conviction about God. *The revival, and even, it may be, the survival of Christianity in the world today depends on its success in this enterprise.*"

We do possess a tool in college work more effective than a mere student center with a kitchen and a secretary. We have the Church. And the Church is its own best evangelist. It is this because it plunges into the deep and speaks of eternal things. It does lead us back to great convictions about God. It does bring divine Grace. The hungers for which it has satisfactions

may be more vivid in student life than we suspect. And in fact, fully apprehended, can give us great hope. It may suggest its own techniques. The Church can lead even this our harrassed generation through the judgments of God and can cleanse it and heal it. In this lies its hidden and sometimes unsuspected strength. We do need, I think, to return courageously to home base, and to appreciate the rich treasures of power which are in our keeping. "The lion hath roared, who shall not fear; the Lord Jehovah hath spoken, who can but prophesy?"

COOPERATIVE PUBLICITY

In Kansas and Missouri

An experiment in "cooperative publicity" proved valuable for the church colleges of Kansas and Missouri. During April, 1934, the college put on educational programs in all of the Protestant churches in Kansas City, Mo., Topeka and Wichita, Kans.; and as many of the Protestant churches as they could reach throughout the state. Posters, publicity material, printed matter, correspondence, radio addresses, etc., were used in presenting the cause. President Schwalm of McPherson College writes "I think it did much toward raising the significance of the church college in the minds of the people of this area. I believe it was a very worth while project and we have decided to repeat the experiment again this year."

Among Lutheran Groups

Sunday, April 15, 1934, was set aside for the observance of Christian Higher Education in the United Lutheran Church and the American Lutheran Conference. This year April 28 will be so observed. The plan of program varies with the group and the parish. In general, the thought is for pastors to preach on Christian Higher Education, and to offer special prayers for students, colleges, and seminaries. The institutions send out special folders and also supply speakers for various occasions. The Sunday Schools, the Luther Leagues, the Women's Missionary Societies, the Brotherhoods, and other Church organizations are called upon to recognize and to be active in promoting the cause.

THE STUDENT WORKERS' ROUND TABLE

HARRY T. STOCK, EDITOR

Rev. H. D. Bollinger, Secretary for the Wesley Foundations, prepares for inclusion in "The Epworth Herald" (740 Rush St., Chicago, Ill.) discussion programs particularly useful for student groups. The following outline, reprinted by permission of "The Epworth Herald," represents the type of subjects and the method of these valuable outlines:

WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT COOPERATIVES?

"What is a cooperative? Hugh J. Hughes, former director of markets, State Department of Agriculture of Minnesota, says in writing about the cooperative movement, 'It (cooperation) is the Golden Rule transformed from words into a way of living.'

"The history of the cooperative movement in America is a stirring narrative of pioneer struggles, difficulties, failures and victories. In an informal manner from the colonial days until the eighteen-sixties, 'cooperatives' flourished wherever pioneers were harvesting, threshing, hog-killing, cotton-picking or caravanning westward in covered wagons. In the fifties, events were stirring for an organized farmers' movement and President Lincoln signed the Homestead Act and the bill that established a Department of Agriculture. The Civil War changed the face of events from a strictly pioneering aspect to scenes of industrial production. Back in 1844 the Rochdale Pioneers' Movement in England, beginning on the theory that there need be and must be no conflict between capital and labor, spread throughout the British Isles and to the United States. Labor unions, organized for self-protection, attempted the cooperative idea in this country but were often thwarted in their efforts by the more immediate bread-and-butter demands brought to the fore in the constant conflicts with capital. The coming of the seventies saw the arrival of the grange movement, an organization of newly found solidarity among farmers.

"Space forbids to tell of the great growth of farmers' elevators, creameries, livestock shipping associations, terminal com-

mission companies, and marketing cooperatives that have come since the turn of the century.

"What is the status of the cooperative movement in the world today? What relationship does it have to the Christian in college or of college age?

"1. It should be borne in mind that we live in a day of poverty, hunger, and cruel conditions because of economic anarchy.

"2. This economic anarchy is the direct result of a system that places private gain first and cooperation last.

"3. The way out is not in a continuance of present conditions but in a change.

"4. The change can be made if Christians will cooperate.

"5. The plan and the way of cooperation are very plain. It is our business as Christians to study, join, encourage and build the cooperative movement in America as Kagawa is doing it in Japan and as it is being done in England, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland.

"Miss Helen Topping, secretary to Mr. Kagawa, says that one should study cooperatives six months before trying to organize one. Therefore, groups might well be brought together to study J. P. Warbasse's 'Cooperative Democracy,' Mrs. Sidney Webb's 'The Discovery of the Consumer,' 'Kagawa in the Philippines,' or 'Christ and Japan,' by Toyohiko Kagawa.

"Mr. Wallace J. Campbell, formerly active in the Wesley Foundation at the University of Oregon, is secretary to Mr. E. R. Bowen, general secretary of the Cooperative League of the U. S. A., at 167 West 12th Street, New York City. From either Mr. Campbell or Mr. Bowen may be secured for very nominal sums the following pamphlets:

"America's Answer—Consumers' Cooperation"

"What Is Consumers' Cooperation?" by Dr. J. P. Warbasse

"The Cooperative Movement," by J. H. Dietrich

"Cooperation Here and Abroad," by Hugh J. Hughes

"The Discovery of the Consumer," by Mrs. Sidney Webb

"Model By-laws for a Consumers' Cooperative Association"

"Sweden, Where Capitalism Is Controlled," by Marquis W. Childs

"The Economic Foundations of World Peace," by Toyohiko Kagawa

- "Consumers' Cooperation Study Outline"
- "How to Start and Run a Consumers' Coop Club"
- "How to Start and Run a Cooperative Store"

"The Cooperative League, a federation of district leagues and of consumers' cooperative associations, is the official United States organization of the Consumers' Cooperative Movement, affiliated with the International Cooperative Alliance. Young people of college age can subscribe to the Consumers' Cooperative magazine, *Cooperation*, for one dollar a year, and join the Cooperative League, a part of the great international cooperative movement.

"The college campus is a very fruitful field for the formation of cooperative groups. Student cooperative book stores are not uncommon. Fifty-seven students at the University of Washington, who faced the problem of cutting expenses or leaving school, formed the Students' Cooperative Association. The group was able to save themselves a total of \$5,000 in living expenses and at the same time make an education possible for a number of students who, under other conditions, would have found that impossible. The experience enabled them to discover 'new social values in a type of group life that emphasizes individual initiative, personal integrity, and practical idealism.' Further information may be secured by addressing The Students' Cooperative Association, 4205 Fifteenth Avenue, N.E., Seattle, Washington.

"Another outstanding illustration from campus life is the Three-Square Club of the Wesley Foundation at the University of Wisconsin. The Rev. Ormal Miller or Mr. Earl Page, addressed at the Wesley Foundation, Madison, Wisconsin, can give details of the plan.

- "Recent general articles on the cooperative movement are:
- "Sweden—Where Consumers Produce," by H. G. Leach, September *Forum*.
- "Consumers Organize," by Professor H. M. Kallen, June 27, *The Christian Century*.
- "The British Bulwark Against Fascism," by Sidney Elliot, June 27, *The Nation*.
- "Organization and Management of Consumers' Cooperative Associations and Clubs," United States Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin, Volume 598, pages 1-71.
- "Consumers' Cooperative Methods," by J. P. Warbasse, *Annals of the American Academy of Social and Political Science*, for May, 1934.

"Development of the Cooperative Movement Throughout the World," Monthly Labor Review of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, December, 1933."

AN APPRAISAL OF THE UNIVERSITY PASTOR MOVEMENT

At the Conference of Church Workers in Universities held at Evanston, Ill., during January 2-4, 1935, there was an interesting panel discussion on the University Pastor Movement. The panel consisted of H. D. Bollinger, University Secretary, the Methodist Episcopal Church; Wendell S. Dysinger, United Lutheran University Pastor, University of Iowa; John W. Findlay, Presbyterian University Pastor, Purdue University; Rowena Kesler, Presbyterian Secretary, Miami University; Herbert W. Evans, Counselor for Protestant Students, Columbia University; Howard R. Chapman, Baptist University Pastor, University of Michigan; Edward W. Blakeman, Counselor in Religious Education, University of Michigan; and M. Willard Lampe, Director, School of Religion, University of Iowa. Besides the panel there was considerable participation from the audience.

Four main topics were discussed: First, democratic relationships among workers in a single church or center; second, greater unity among the religious groups in a given university center; third, should the work be primarily campus-centered or church-centered; and fourth, the concern of the movement with promoting a better economic and social order.

The discussion revealed a wide variety of views on all these questions, and, so far as there was any consensus at all, it was the feeling that allowance must be made for many different types of approach and emphasis. Democracy among the workers is highly desirable, but executive leadership is also necessary. Greater unity among the religious groups is urgent, but we cannot ignore the denominational set-up of which we are a part. The work must have two centers, namely, the church and the university. Social issues must be prophetically faced, but the individual student also has his personal needs which must not be ignored. So again the solution seemed to be not "either-or" but "both-and."

WHAT IS NEW IN THE RELIGIOUS PROBLEM OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY?*

EDWIN E. AUBREY

The Divinity School, The University of Chicago

It is difficult to identify any problem as new for every problem has a history which carries it back to the old. Furthermore, every problem in the field of religion has an ultimate personal bearing which is perennial. The more one reads of history the less is one impressed with novelty: it is easy to be original if one be ignorant enough. The problem which now looks new to me as I state it will probably display cobwebs to the man who knows his history more thoroughly than I do. We may, however, say that a new aspect of the religious problem is the radical skepticism which makes conviction as such suspect.

A number of factors have conspired to produce this problem. One has only to mention the names of Newton, Lyell, Darwin, and Einstein to realize how the acids of modernity have eaten away the assurance of one belief after another. Furthermore, the rapid growth of knowledge has developed such a feeling for complexity that any problem on the way to solution is estopped by complications. Descartes laid it down as a fundamental principle of thought that every problem should be broken up into a number of problems; and today that man is considered educated who has a feeling of complexity. But that feeling for complexity brings with it an attitude of distrust shown towards the man who presumes to solve a problem. The development of modern science has created the attitude of objective criticism. This very development of objectivity depends upon the exercise of doubt. Cromwell is alleged to have said on one occasion to some Scottish divines, "Bethink you, gentlemen, that you may be wrong." Objectivity has speeded up the process of alteration between belief and doubt so that the sophisticate scarcely adopts an attitude of belief without immediately assuming the attitude of doubt. Recent preoccupation with theory of knowl-

* Summary of an address delivered at the Conference of Church Workers in Universities, Evanston, Illinois, January 2-4, 1935.

edge has intercepted all movements from experience to facts. When Berkeley first threw doubt upon the reality of anything outside of us he made the very facts of common sense dubious; until eventually we have come to the point where one philosophy seriously proposes that a fact is "an area of agreement."

In addition to philosophic thought, recent developments in psychology have raised a serious problem. It is difficult now to turn to "common experience" to bolster up conviction since the studies in crowd behavior by Le Bon and Sighele exposed the frequency of collective illusions. More recently the Freudian psychology has initiated an exploration of the compulsive bases of our convictions. The stronger the conviction the more the convinced man is suspected of uncertainty. The favorite text of this skepticism is found in Shakespeare: "He doth protest too much." Consequently we become so inhibited in the declaration of convictions that we develop a new sort of intellectual prudery. This in turn makes mutual reenforcement of faith more difficult for we now come to be afraid of declaring our deepest convictions to one another lest we betray some hidden complex.

But while this begins as an intellectual problem it reaches out to wider bearings. The most obvious of these is what has been referred to as "the hedonism of disillusionment." Since no solution is acceptable because everyone is conditioned by uncertainty, cynicism ensues: "What is the use of trying to find solutions?" The next step is to try to forget. This attempt to forget may issue in a desperate whirl of pleasure. It may also result in an attempt to have a "religion without theology."

But the absence of conviction presents a still more serious problem when it leads to the disintegration of personal life. Since personality is an organization of energy with reference to some purposes, the absence of all conviction leaves the individual without an organizing center. The lack of this organizing center leads activity into frustration and frustration produces despair. But the difficulty does not end here, for it is out of despairing of all one's own attempts to achieve conviction that people are led to embrace external authority. Yearning for stability and unable to find it within, sophisticates will submit to the dictator who can artificially create it from with-

out. This is the real reason why Fascism is a genuine possibility even in intellectual circles.

What, then, are we to do about it? In the first place, we must learn to supplement genetic tests of conviction with functional tests. After all an idea is not proved true or false because one receives it from one's mother. The test is to be found in its capacity to explain our experience to us. A complete test of conviction must include both its genesis and its function; and if conviction is to be realistic then it must rest on a view of the world in which both genesis and function are bound together.

In the second place, it is time we insisted on the need for simplification as the basis of any action. Simplification is one of the most valuable processes of thought. The scientist recognizes this in his idea of "delimiting the area of inquiry." If we are to become adjusted we must delimit the problem of adjustment. Furthermore, a simplification enables a problem to be illuminated by experience. Since life is essentially unified it is possible to approach its complexity from any one point and the attainment of variety in unity is what gives perspective in living.

Nay, further simplification is not only valuable; it is inevitable. All attention and interest is simplification since it excludes items on the periphery of consciousness and simplifies the situation in terms of some focal point. Science rests on simplification as we have already seen; and we are told that all aesthetic appreciation is a point of view with reference to an object. To be sure we must avoid oversimplification by testing a conviction for its applicability to our widest range of experience, and we must also test it by applying it practically in action in as many areas as possible. We are thus brought back to what is an old idea in religion, that conviction is tested by self-commitment, which is the investment of one's whole life in an idea.

Finally, we must remember that conviction is organization of the emotional as well as the intellectual life. The idea must not be presented in detachment as though it existed in an emotional vacuum. It must rather be related to the deepest emotional concerns. Precisely here is one of the great weaknesses of liberal Christianity, that it has stated Christian convictions without reference to the emotional depths with which religion

has always had to be concerned. Restatements of belief must be made in more vital terms if conviction is to be recovered; and, furthermore, we cannot expect conviction to be generated unless emotional experience is developed with reference to beliefs through subjecting these beliefs to genuinely critical situations. In a word, conviction will come not solely with intellectual argument but with moral and religious adventure where sacrifice is entailed and where the whole of life is called into question.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION HANDBOOK FOR 1934

Edited by ROBERT L. KELLY and RUTH E. ANDERSON

Statistics of approximately 800 church-related colleges and universities, junior colleges, theological seminaries, training and secondary schools.

A comprehensive list of Protestant teachers of Bible, religion and religious education.

The latest standards of the accrediting agencies.

Names and addresses of about 1500 religious workers with students.

And other features which have made the *HANDBOOK* the outstanding reference work in the field of denominational education.

\$1.25 paper

\$2.00 cloth

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION
744 Jackson Pl., Washington, D. C.

THE FAILURES OF SECULARISM*

WM. LINDSAY YOUNG

The Board of Christian Education
The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

Secularism is a philosophy of life which maintains that man's highest and noblest purposes may be realized apart from any religious faith or practice. Man has within himself sufficient resources for the realization of his objectives. There is no attempt on the part of the secularist to deny the existence of a controlling intelligence called God. That God may, or may not, exist is of no concern to him. He has done very little conscious philosophizing on the subject. He has just unwittingly drifted into the notion that even if God does exist he has become quite unnecessary to the fundamental quests of man. Professor Atkins says that "secularism is literally 'this age-ism' and our age has it acutely." It spends the whole of life with a complete absorption in "Vanity Fair, either as spectator, buyer, seller, producer, consumer, or financier, with marginal occupations of banditry and racketeering." It centers its interests, says Harris E. Kirk, "not in the status of the soul, but upon economic stability of material possessions." He quotes Oswald Spengler as saying that our spiritual distresses are upon us, "because we have descended from the perspective of the bird to that of a frog."

This outlook upon life has been most subtle in its influence. Many who have assumed that they had a theistic outlook upon the struggles of humanity will find, upon personal inventory, that their belief in God is, after all, theoretical. Practically speaking they are secularists. They have not abolished God from the universe, they have just left him out of the affairs of this work-a-day world.

Secularism, as defined in the opening statement, fails on at least three points. First, it fails *philosophically*. It does not give us an adequately rational interpretation of life and the

* Paper read at the meeting of the Presbyterian College Union, Atlanta, Ga., January 15, 1934.

universe. Second, it fails *religiously*. Mankind nowhere has found complete satisfaction in a world without the unseen Companion to meet the deepest needs and yearnings of his innermost being. Third, secularism fails in the realm of *social values*. It gives no great leadership to the confused day in which we find ourselves. It fires none to sacrificial service. Let us examine these three claims more closely.

Secularism Fails Philosophically

It is fair to charge the secularist with intellectual superficiality except from a purely pragmatic and functional point of view. He has the boldness to assume that Man's quest of life's meaning is futile. His existence begins and ends with the passing interest of the day. What is the nature of our universe? What is its meaning? Is it rational? Has it a purpose or destiny? If it has purpose where does man gear into it? Or, has man no responsibility in sharing in any possible cosmic movements? Here are questions that will not down. They are some of the persistent interrogations of the human mind. "But," the secularist responds, "your questions are unfair. The secularist is not interested in these matters and has therefore not taken time out to formulate his opinions." All of which is further evidence to substantiate the claims as to his superficiality. He has no answers to these questions because he has not thought, at least profoundly, concerning them. The secularist realizes his highest aspirations when he can produce an improved type of bathtub, increase the output of safety razor blades by so many per hour, or invent hole-proof socks. But do not ask him concerning the fundamental ends of life. If you do he is apt to tell you, if he is honest and outspoken, that he doesn't know, nor does he care. Answers to these questions which have occupied the minds of great thinkers all the way from Socrates to Whitehead are of no interest to the secularist because, even if you can find them, they will bake no bread.

Part of the reason for this superficiality is the crass materialism of its adherents. Of what concern is it to the secularist to find an answer to a question if it does not find its ultimate expression in increased bank accounts. Of what use is an ex-

planation of the nature of the universe if it does not help one in the acquisition of the material goods of this life. Is it true? Is it good? Is it beautiful? The ancients at whose feet we still sit to learn asked these questions. Because of his all consuming concern for technological security, the secularist has his own set of questions. Of what use is this product? Has it a market? Will it pay? Everything is reduced to the common denominator called utility.

In his book, "A Preface to Christian Faith in a New Age," Rufus M. Jones says, "There is extremely little serious and severe thinking behind secular modern drifts. They are not the result of profound thinking but rather of thin and superficial living." Secularism's havoc, he says, "is altogether out of proportion to the stock of mental power which is supposed to give it." Just this evening I started to read some of those beautiful lines in Shelley's "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty"

"The awful shadow of some unseen Power
Floats through unseen among us"

and before I could go any further I was interrupted by a leather-lunged radio announcer who blasted forth "When do we eat? That is the important question every healthy person asks." Then he proceeded to advertise a certain brand of mush!

Perhaps it should be noted that it is at this point that secularism differs from contemporary humanism. Both attitudes toward life have much in common but the humanist has seriously constructed his world view. Humanism has informed us in no uncertain terms what it holds as a world view. That is why it can be combated so easily. And it might be added that that is why it has so quickly subsided as a factor in present day religious and philosophic thought. We are told frankly by the humanist that man's social hopes can be realized without a sustaining Providence. Humanism is secularism thought through to a negative but perfectly logical conclusion. In the end we are left with stark atheism on our hands.

Secularism Fails Religiously

Secularism fails as thoroughly from a *religious* point of view as it does from a philosophical one. It is just as emotionally

sterile as it is culturally thin. If one could, by some good fortune, induce the secularist to think seriously and profoundly for a moment we might ask him in all seriousness if he expects his fellow mortals to be satisfied with life permanently devoid of the great spiritual realities. The question is not simply a matter of agreement with some creed, venerable literature, or ecclesiastical institution. What is he to do with religion as an experience, as a psychological fact. One of the most universal traits of man in all ages and places is religious experience. The secularist may just as well snap his fingers at the sunrise as to be indifferent and nonchalant about those grim realities with which the human soul has always been concerned. "My heart crieth out for the living God." "If a man die shall he live again?" "What must I do to be saved?" The urgency of these questions is in the very nature of man. They must be faced religiously.

Professor Montague, in his very worthwhile little book "Belief Unbound" puts the issue sharply when he says that religion as he conceives it is the acceptance of "a momentous possibility—the possibility, namely, that what is highest in spirit is also deepest in nature, that the ideal and the real are at least to some extent identified, not merely evanescently in our own lives but enduringly in the universe itself. If this possibility were an actuality, if there were at the heart of nature something akin to us, a conserver and increaser of values, and if we could not only know this and act upon it, but really feel it, life would suddenly become radiant."

The secularist cannot speak to man's need in such a matter as this great possibility. When one wants to know if religious experience is useless in this world, and if he is the outcome of blindly whirling atoms, the secularist has no answer. Practically speaking, secularism is the same as atheism. Of what use is the existence of a God who is totally unrelated to the affairs of man? The effect is the same in the end. The result of knowing nothing of fellowship with "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" may not lead to immoral living but it certainly makes for a feeling of desolation and loneliness. The man without God has been described by Robert Whitaker—

"No God—no soul—no life to come—
 No will beyond our will—
Nothing that reasoning can plumb
 But vast unreason still—
And this—the summit of the known—
 Man—sitting on a mad-house throne."

Secularism Fails in Social Idealism

The final score upon which secularism proves itself inadequate is in the realm of *social values*. It has no prophets of social idealism for the simple reason that it is lacking in social vision on the one hand, and has cut the nerve of sacrificial service on the other by its practical denial of any cosmic support for the realization of man's aspirations.

A study of the social prophets reveals the significance of religious faith as a motivating influence in their lives. I am not now thinking of the social prophets of the Bible nor the ministers of the church who have been responsive to social need. I am thinking of men like John Howard, the great soul who did so much for the reform of European penal institutions in the 18th century. He saw men in prison who were ill, cold and hungry. He saw men without bedding, or straw to sleep upon. He says that after visiting some of the jails his clothes were so offensive that all the windows of his cab had to be left open while he rode in it. The memorandum book in which he made notes would become so tainted he had to let it lie open before a fire for an hour or two before he could rid it of its disagreeable odor. He saw idiots and lunatics thrown in with hardened criminals and innocent victims. Men and women, young and old, were all thrown together.

Read the story of John Howard's life and its influence on the reform of these penal institutions and then ask the question, "What sent that man forth to accomplish his purpose of reforming the wicked treatment of criminals?" It was in a covenant he had made with God. He had committed his life fully into the hands of God and he believed implicitly that God had called him to do this very thing. Look at John Howard, ailing, middle-aged, an ex-grocer's apprentice, and then subtract from him his religious faith and see what little there is left. Here was a man with moral courage enough to visit pestilence ridden dun-

geons from which even doctors shrank. In a speech at Bristol, Burke paid the following tribute to John Howard for his single-minded, unswerving, unselfish devotion to a needy cause.

"I cannot name this gentleman without remarking that his labours and writings have done much to open the eyes and hearts of mankind. He has visited all Europe—not to survey the sumptuousness of palaces, or the stateliness of temples; not to make accurate measurements of the remains of ancient grandeur, nor to form a scale of the curiosity of modern art; not to collect medals, or collate manuscripts—but to dive into the depths of dungeons and plunge into the infection of hospitals; to survey the mansions of sorrow and pain; to take the gauge and measure of misery, depression and contempt; to remember the forgotten, to attend to the neglected, to visit the forsaken, and compare and collate the miseries of all men in all countries. His plan is original; and it is full of genius as it is of humanity." Yes, and behind the inspiring life was his faith in a kindly Providence who strengthens and guides consecrated man to high achievements.

Read the life of William Wilberforce, a mighty foe of slavery before Lincoln was born. What was the mainspring of his great service to the down-trodden? He wrote it in his own journal. The suppression of the slave trade was an object which, he said, "God Almighty has set before me."

Most people who know of him at all think of William Morris as only a poet. He was much more. As a student in Oxford he studied architecture, not with a view to becoming a professional architect but for the purpose of creating homes fit for human beings to inhabit. In later years he turned to such crafts as hand-painting, furniture-making, dyeing,—all with a single purpose in view—to minister to the vital needs of man. He said little about religious belief but no one doubts that he was one who sought first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness.

The questions which we ask of the secularist then, are simply these: Can you thus demonstrate the social value of your philosophy? Is there in it a sense of mission? Has it social dynamic? Does it link up with the creative activity and purpose of God? Does it give anything like a satisfactory answer to the fundamental questions our fellow mortals have long asked

about life? Can it ever solve the varied and complex tensions of our universal social structure so long as the ultimate source and sanction of its ethic is found no higher than the natural desires of man apart from God? Can it give us statesmen of the noblest and highest ideals when, as Coe has said, "Secularity has come to have the implication of practical materialism in state affairs." Can our American system of public schools ever render adequate educational service to society when its basic secularity frankly eliminates from its total program any consideration of devotion to the Highest? If the secularist were to answer he could only respond in the negative. Life becomes meaningful, challenging, joyous, and alluring only when we can say with the poet:

"This is my Father's world,
And to my listening ears,
All nature sings, and round me rings
The Music of the spheres.

"This is my Father's world:
The battle is not done,
Jesus who died shall be satisfied,
And heaven and earth be one."

ABRAM WINEGARDNER HARRIS

1858-1935

College Professor and University President, Educational Administrator, Organizer, Expert Contributor to Christian Higher Education.

IS THE SABBATICAL YEAR WORTH WHILE?

BY ONE WHO HAS TRIED IT

(*Ed. Note.*—A teacher who recently spent a year in Florida, absent on sabbatical leave, now back at work in the public schools of Montclair, N. J., sends the following interesting comment on the plan of sabbatical leave as operative in the Montclair schools. Should college boards take notice?)

Is the sabbatical leave worth while?

Early in the teaching career of a teacher, the privilege of taking a year for study, with the financial aid of half of one's salary, gives opportunity for professional advancement. This after seven years of teaching in one city or town.

After teaching seven years more, or a total of fourteen years, comes the opportunity to travel and become acquainted with other parts of this world in which we live and of which we know largely only through reading and picture. This gives an inspiration much needed by any one who has not had the chance to travel widely before.

After twenty years in a given place, however, there is granted a play year, to do with as one wills—to carry out long cherished dreams, to try experiments for which there is so little time in a busy teacher's life, to see parts of the world for longer times than the summer vacations allow, or just to stay at home and really live the home life such as many of us love; in other words, to do as one's spirit moves him to do. All of this gives a new and broader outlook, a chance to "size things up" more accurately away from the immediate scene of action, relief from strain on nerves which have been so constantly called into action year after year. It also leads one to appreciate more fully the greatness of the teacher's task and the splendid opportunity which is his or hers in the training and possibility of influencing the lives of some of the young people entrusted to the care of the teachers of to-day.

Perhaps one's half salary is not enough to cover all one may wish to do, but in the seven years between leaves of absence it may be quite possible to put by regularly each year enough to

supplement and make more enjoyable these years of vacation and so make more of the dreams come true when the year does come around.

Our board of education most generously grants these years of leave from service; the first, for study after seven years in this system; the second, for travel after fourteen years in this system; and the third, after twenty years in this system, to be spent as desired. These are to be consecutive years of service.

Not only is half of the year's salary allowed, but the natural increase in salary is allowed both for the year of absence and for the following year, so that nothing is lost in salary increase. Besides all this, the year of leave is counted as a year of service for pension purposes, thus avoiding any loss there also.

One agreement the teacher taking sabbatical leave makes is, that he or she will return to teach for at least three years, and in case of failure to do so, there is to be repaid to the board of education such part of the sabbatical year salary as is proportionate to the part of the stipulated three years not taught after return.

Such value I have found in broadened outlook, new viewpoints, and renewed inspiration as a result of a year spent in this way, that I most earnestly recommend that any teacher who has the privilege of a sabbatical year, seize it at the earliest moment.

And surely any board of education is acting for its best interests in every way in making available to the teacher in its system such a privilege as the sabbatical year.—*L. P. H.*

"IF I WERE A COLLEGE PRESIDENT AGAIN"

The Annual and Review Number of THE CHRISTIAN-EVANGELIST, published in January, 1934, by the Christian Board of Publication of the Disciples of Christ, contains a very stimulating article by Dr. H. O. Pritchard under the caption, "If I Were a college President Again." Dr. Pritchard outlines "a distinctive program of sound education and true religion," of which he says—"I believe a college even in these stressful days can draw to itself both students and support." In brief, his statement is as follows:

First of all, there would be a frank recognition on my part of the present educational, religious and financial situation as it really exists. I should do my very best to be a realist at this point and not proceed on any false assumptions. (1) College attendance has reached the saturation point. This does not mean no increase in attendance, but it means only slight increases of from 3 to 5 per cent per annum. (2) Vocational education of the more narrow and early specialized type has reached its climax; there is to be a reversion to the more cultural type in the days immediately ahead. (3) Already we are in a period of severe educational competition; we have come to the day of eliminations, mergers and readjustments. (4) The present depression marks the end in all probability of an epoch in American economic and industrial history. American philanthropy is to be profoundly affected; new bases and techniques for promoting worthy causes must be round. (5) Economic conditions, breakdown of denominational loyalties, good roads, etc., tend to lessen the distance that students travel to college and recent surveys have proved the tendency is distinctly toward student bodies becoming more local in their character. These and other factors mean that a college of the size, location, constituency and resources suggested must work out some distinctive education program.

Under these conditions, a practicable program would emphasize character-formation, with vocational choices and pre-vocational preparation as a secondary objective. This would involve (1) a complete shift from a subject-centered curriculum to a student-centered one; (2) a complete coordination of all subjects and courses taught in the institution; (3) a new teaching

technique—use of the laboratory method throughout the entire institution; the institution itself would be a big laboratory with experimentation in constant progress; (4) the upper and lower divisions would be maintained, the first affording thorough knowledge of the "tool subjects," while the last would permit as rapid progress as the student could make along the lines of his choice, with a comprehensive examination capping the four years' work; (5) the use of all types of tests, physical and intellectual for diagnosis and prescription; (6) a sound system of vocational guidance, with due regard to aptitudes and opportunities; (7) faculty advisers for every student, the tutorial system in the last two years; (8) limitation of specialization in upper division to those planning to teach or enter full-time Christian service; (9) The Christian motive, outlook and spirit would be made dominant throughout every phase of the institution's life.

A CAUSE—NOT AN INSTITUTION

AN EDITORIAL

Last summer at the University of Chicago an Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Education was held. The proceedings of that institute were published in the fall of 1934 under the title, "General Education, Its Nature, Scope, and Essential Elements." Professing to describe the "essential elements" of education, it is significant that the word religion does not appear in the Table of Contents nor in the Index. The word does occur in the context as follows, "There are two ways of looking at life, the essentially religious and the scientific" (p. 38).

Here lies the issue in American education. Shall we allow a certain group of educators to take religion from education? For many years leaders of church-related colleges have claimed that some educators were wholly indifferent to the essential and vital place of religion in education. Their claim is now fully acknowledged. Constructive thinkers and loyal Americans have been warning us of the subtle influences at work in our schools endeavoring to undermine our family life, our patriotism, our

culture, our religion. Their warnings appear to be amply justified.

Christian Higher Education stands for religious freedom. The Pilgrim fathers sailed through three thousand miles of the mystery and storm of the sea to the wilderness of New England's rock-bound shore to retain and enjoy that freedom. Will that freedom be lost? Will the forces trying to regiment economic and political processes accomplish the same for religion in America as has been done in other countries? Shall we allow religion to be not only regimented but eventually suppressed? Our American spirit and our religious principles rebel against the thought as well as any program with such objectives.

The church-related colleges of America have truths for which they contend and principles upon which they stand: the reality of a living personal God; the value of a man as potentially a child of God; the freedom of the will to make decisions; the fact of a fundamental moral system not subject to the whims and wishes of man; the presence of a Power directing the wheels of destiny, giving hope of progress, and making man an heir of a Kingdom not made by hands.

The church-related colleges cannot be deterred from their fight on the paganism in modern life. No amount of soft-soaping, no clever baiting, no beautiful white-washing, no high-sounding phrases will tempt these colleges to lay-low. These colleges know that without religion education is defective and incomplete. These colleges know that religion must be christian. These colleges are striving to keep the Christ in Education. The leaders of church-related colleges are fighting for a cause, not for their institutions.